

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/501,052

Confirmation No.: 1642

In re application of: Jian Yu

Filed: July 9, 2004

Technology Center/Art Unit: 1651

Examiner: H. Lilling

Docket No.: D9180-00015

Title: PRODUCTION OF
BIODEGRADABLE THERMOPLASTIC
MATERIALS FROM ORGANIC WASTES

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Restriction Requirement dated April 11, 2006. The Examiner requires an election between Group I, **Claims 1-7**, drawn to a method, classified in class 435, subclass 135, or Group II, **Claims 8-10**, drawn to a system, classified in class 435, subclass 294.1.

Applicant hereby provisionally elects Group I, Claims 1-7. This election is made with traverse.

In addition, the Examination of both groups concurrently is requested, given the commonality of subject matter between the two groups. The Manual of Patent Examining

Procedure (M.P.E.P.) recites the requirements for a proper restriction requirement. In particular, the M.P.E.P. states:

There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

(A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP Section 802.01, Section 806.04, Section 808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP Section 806.05 – Section 806.05(i)); *and*

(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP Section 803.02, Section 806.04(a) – Section 806.04(i), Section 808.01(a), and Section 808.02).

(M.P.E.P. § 803 (emphasis added)). The fact that *both* criteria must be satisfied is made all the more clear by the following statement in the M.P.E.P.:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner *must* examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

(M.P.E.P. § 803 (emphasis added)).

Thus, if the subject matter of the pending claims is such that there would be no serious burden on the examiner to search and examine all of the pending claims at the same time, the examiner is to do so, *even if* the pending claims are drawn to independent or distinct inventions.

Although Group I is directed to a method and Group II is directed to a system, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of Group I and Group II are closely related such that examination of both groups would not pose an undue burden on the Examiner. The Examiner would have to review substantially the same prior art to examine Group II as is already being searched and reviewed in order to examine the elected Group I. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/501,052
Reply to Office Action of April 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/9/06

Richard A. Paikoff
Richard A. Paikoff, Reg. No.: 34,892
Attorney for Applicant

DUANE MORRIS LLP
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-4196
(215) 979-1853 (Telephone)
(215) 979-1020 (Fax)